

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the due consideration given the application.

**1.0 Claim Status**

Claims 22-44 are pending in the application.

The applicants have changed the expression "A computer program [...]" in claims 43 and 44 into the expression "A computer readable recording medium recording thereon a computer program, in a non-transitory state, [...]".

The applicants have amended claims 22 and 33 so as to clarify that (i) each of the plurality of play list informations includes a plurality of play item informations, (ii) each of the plurality of play item informations defining reproduction sequence of one part of the plurality of content informations by a unit of an item, and (iii) one play item information can be shared by the plurality of play list informations. This amendment is based on paragraph 0157 of the published specification of the present application (US2006/0280075A1).

The applicants have cancelled claim 45.

No new matter is believed to be added to the application by this amendment.

**2.0 Rejection Under 35 USC §101**

Claims 43-45 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, the applicants have changed the expression "A computer program [...]" in claims 43 and 44 into the expression "A computer readable recording medium recording thereon a computer program, in a non-transitory state, [...]". Thus, claims 43 and 44 do not included the transitory propagating signals.

In addition, as described above, the applicants have cancelled claim 45.

Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 should be withdrawn.

### **3.0 Rejection Over Ninomiya**

Claims 1-36 and 39-45 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Ninomiya (US 2002/0090197A).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

There are at least five differences between the present invention and Ninomiya, which will be set forth below.

#### **3.1. First Difference**

Ninomiya does not disclose first novel feature of the present invention such that *"some of the plurality of content informations are different from each other in reproduction functions required for an information reproduction system"*. Namely, Ninomiya does not disclose the first novel feature of the present invention such that the reproduction function of one of

the plurality of content informations is different from that of another one of the plurality of content informations.

More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the above novel feature was disclosed in the paragraph 0064 of Ninomiya. However, the applicants cannot agree with this interpretation. The paragraph 0064 of Ninomiya merely discloses that the sequential reproduction over the picture data at the end of the preceding reproduction section and the picture data at the beginning of the subsequent reproduction section is difficult. However, Ninomiya does not disclose, suggest or teach that the reproduction function of the picture data at the end of the preceding reproduction section is different from that of the picture data at the beginning of the subsequent reproduction section. Thus, it is clear that Ninomiya does not disclose the above first novel feature of the present invention.

### 3.2. Second Difference

Ninomiya does not disclose the second novel feature of the present invention such that the *"reproduction sequence of said some of the plurality of content informations are defined by the plurality of play list informations indicated by one of the first informations"*.

As described above, Ninomiya does not disclose the first novel feature of the present invention such that the reproduction function of one of the plurality of content informations is different from that of another one of the plurality of content

informations. Thus, it is clear that Ninomiya does not disclose the second novel feature of the present invention such that "reproduction sequence of said some of the plurality of content informations, whose reproduction functions are different from each other, are defined by the plurality of play list informations indicated by one of the first informations".

### 3.3. Third Difference

Ninomiya does not disclose the third novel feature of the present invention such that *"each of the plurality of play list informations includes a plurality of play item informations"*.

More specifically, Ninomiya discloses that (i) the PGCI (Program Chain Information) table (see column 0059 and Fig. 3 of Ninomiya), (ii) the PGCI table includes a plurality of play list information (see column 0059 and Fig. 3 of Ninomiya), (iii) each of the plurality of play list information includes a sequence of CELL information (see column 0059 and Fig. 3 of Ninomiya) and (iv) the sequence of CELL information shows the order of the reproduction sections. Namely, Ninomiya discloses, as the hierarchy of the definition of the reproduction order, the PGCI table, play list information and CELL information.

However, because there are not multiple PGCI tables, the *"PGCI table"* of Ninomiya cannot be interpreted as the *"first information"* of the present invention. Thus, even if the *"play list information"* of Ninomiya may be interpreted as the *"first information"* of the present invention and the *"CELL information"*

of Ninomiya may be interpreted as the *"play list information"* of the present invention, Ninomiya does not disclose the plurality of *"play item information"* of the present invention, because the *"CELL information"* of Ninomiya merely includes only one VOB\_I\_SRP, only one Cell\_Start\_PTM and only one Cell\_End\_PTM (i.e. the *"CELL information"* of Ninomiya does not include a plurality of VOB\_I\_SRPs, a plurality of Cell\_Start\_PTM s or a plurality of Cell\_End\_PTM s).

Thus, Ninomiya does not disclose third novel feature of the present invention such that *"each of the plurality of play list informations includes a plurality of play item informations"*.

#### 3.4. Fourth Difference

Ninomiya does not disclose the fourth novel feature of the present invention such that *"one play item information can be shared by the plurality of play list informations"*.

More specifically, as described above, Ninomiya does not disclose *"a plurality of play item informations"* of the present invention. Thus, it is obvious that Ninomiya does not disclose the fourth novel feature of the present invention which is related to the *"play item information"*.

#### 3.5. Conclusion

As described above, Ninomiya does not disclose or suggest the above four novel features of the present invention. Therefore, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn, as is respectfully requested.

#### **4.0 Statement of Substance of Interview**

The Examiner is thanked for graciously conducting a personal interview with the applicants' representative on August 19, 2010. During the interview the patentability of the present invention over Ninomiya was discussed along with potential amendments to the claims which define over Ninomiya, which are reflected in the instant amendment.

At the end of the interview the Examiner prepared an interview summary. The interview summary has been reviewed, and it appears to accurately reflect the content of the interview.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

As no issues remain, the issuance of a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future submissions, to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Robert E. Goozner/  
Robert E. Goozner, Reg. No. 42,593  
Customer No. 00466  
209 Madison Street, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

REG/dl